## Remarks

The final Office Action mailed April 19, 2005, has been received and reviewed. Claims 26-45 and 53-71 are currently pending in the application. Claims 26-45 were previously withdrawn from consideration. Claims 53-71 stand rejected. Claims 55-57, 64 and 67 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 53, 58-60 and 71 are amended herein, but do not add new matter. All amendments are made without prejudice or disclaimer. This Amendment is filed with a Request for Continued Examination. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### Claim Objection

Claim 67 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as allegedly being an improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim. In an effort to expedite prosecution, applicants have canceled claim 67. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

### 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 53-54 and 58-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Examiner stated that it "would be remedial to amend the claims to recite that the chimeric phage is a filamentous phage and that the capsid protein is the g3 protein." (Office Action, page 7). Independent claims 53 and 71 of the presently claimed invention recite "a proteinaceous molecule fused to a g3 phage coat protein capable of mediating infection of a host by the chimaeric filamentous phage particle." Support for the amendments to the claims may be found throughout the as-filed specification. For example, the amendments to claims 53 and 71 find support in canceled claims 55, 57 and 64 and paragraphs [0027], [0028], [0030] and [0036] and support for the amendments to claims 58-60 are found throughout the specification including paragraph [0020]. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 66 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The term "a functional part thereof" in claim 66 and the term "derived from" in claim 70 were objected to. With respect to claim 66, the term "a functional part thereof" refers to any of the members in the recited group of binding molecules. Applicants respectfully submit that the term "derived from" in claim 70 would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. The term is frequently used in patents claims and would be further understood in view of paragraph [0004] of the specification. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections**

Claims 53-68 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Rudert at al. (hereinafter "Rudert"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Rudert discloses using SIP to select multiple protein-protein interactions simultaneously from libraries. (Abstract). By way of contrast with Rudert, independent claims 53 and 71 of the presently claimed invention include similar recitations of "culturing the host cell to allow assembly of the chimaeric filamentous phage particle, the chimaeric filamentous phage particle displaying a mixture of proteins on its surface, the mixture comprising the mutant form of the g3 phage coat protein and the fusion protein, wherein the fusion protein is attached to the chimaeric filamentous phage particle via the g3 phage coat protein capable of mediating infection of a host by the chimaeric filamentous phage particle." The "mutant form comprises a deletion of the D1 region, D2 region or both regions of the g3 phage coat protein."

Rudert fails to disclose "the fusion protein is attached to the chimaeric filamentous phage particle via the g3 phage coat protein capable of mediating infection of a host by the chimaeric filamentous phage particle" as recited in independent claims 53 and 71 of the presently claimed invention. Instead, Rudert discloses that the ligand (peptide 3) is attached to the phage particle via the C-terminal domain of g3 (*i.e.*, the g3-CT domain)(Rudert, Fig. 2C). The C-terminal domain (D3) of g3 is incapable of mediating infection of a host by the phage particle. Further, attaching the peptide 3 through a g3 protein capable of mediating infection of a host by the phage particle would make the resulting phages unsuitable for their intended use in the SIP technology.

As Rudert fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, every element of the presently claimed invention, it does not anticipate the invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**Conclusion**

Claims 53, 54, 58-63, 65, 66, and 68-71 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Office determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Krista Weber Powell
Registration No. 47,867
Attorney for Applicant(s)
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: June 20, 2005
KWP/jm
Document in ProLaw